

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action of June 21, 2006. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-9, and 15 as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Leeuwestein '187. The Office Action states that Figure 1 of Leeuwestein '187 discloses a roll (2a) connected in a rotationally fixed manner to a roll shaft (4) via a frictional connection provided by clamping disks (2b). The Office Action states that the roll is held in its axial position on the roll shaft in a positive-locking manner by sleeve elements (7a) adjoining the roll axially with respect to the roll shaft.

By this Amendment, Claim 1 has been amended to recite "sleeve elements contacting the roll" Leeuwestein '187 fails to disclose a roll held in its axial position on the roll shaft in a positive-locking manner by bushes 7 and 7a contacting the roll axially with respect to the roll shaft. As shown in Fig. 1 of Leeuwestein '187, element 7a is axially spaced from the working roller 2, the rolling annulus 2a, and the clamping disks 2b, which cannot be considered "contacting." Stated differently, the adjusting bushes 7 and 7a do not "contact" the roll at any point and, therefore, there is no way that the adjusting bushes 7 and 7a can hold the roll in its axial position on the roll shaft in a positive locking manner. Thus, for this reason, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection over Leeuwestein '187 will be withdrawn.

In addition, Applicants submit that there is no single embodiment in Leeuwestein that discloses all of the features of Claim 1, as amended. The Office rejection is based on features disclosed in connection with both Fig. 1 and Fig. 3 of the Leeuwestein reference. However, Fig. 1 and Fig. 3 of Leeuwestein and the corresponding written disclosures are directed to alternative embodiments. It is respectfully submitted that

neither of the embodiments discloses all of the elements of Claim 1. Accordingly, Leeuwestein cannot anticipate amended Claim 1.

Moreover, there is no suggestion of combining the features of these two alternative embodiments. The principles utilized by the Fig. 1 and Fig. 3 are independent of one another and Leeuwestein provides no suggestion that they could or should be combined.


Claim 15, which was objected to but deemed allowable, has been amended to include the structural features of claim 1, as suggested by the Examiner. Applicants submit that inclusion of the structural features of claim 10 in amended claim 15 is not required.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that amended claim 1 (and claim 15) and all of the remaining claims which depend from it are now clearly patentable over Leeuwestein '187. **Applicants would welcome an opportunity to discuss the claims and the art with the Examiner in a telephonic interview prior to the issuance of an Office Action.**

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Andrew G. Kolomayets
Reg. No. 33,723

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Attorney for the Applicant

Dated: December 20, 2006